



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_44632
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFICACY OF TURMERIC RHIZOME (Curcuma longa) and MORINGA LEAVES (Moringa oleifera) AQUEOUS EXTRACT IN SEED TREATMENT AGAINST FUNGI ASSOCIATED WITH MAIZE SEEDS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of „**lack of Novelty**“, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Farin - gada market of Jos North Local 70 Government area, Plateau State. This location is unclear kindly complete this. Add the map of specified location. Tumeric rhizome and Moringa leaves: its better to put the scientific names There is no information about extract yield. Kindly add percentage yield of extract Identification of Fungi Isolates is usually performed through expert or not by atlas. If it was performed from other laboratory then kindly mentioned the details. Fig: Experimental plates: No labeling and I couldnot understand by simple picture Table 2: Fungi Features/Characteristics is not required Improper details about Table 4 and table 5. Discussion is incomplete and no comparison with previous reports Outdated reference used	Have made little correction, 70 was not included in the address I have both the common name and scientific name on the title. Was not considered The identification was supervised by an expert and further matched with a standard It actually showed blotter method of testing for fungal germination Needed to be added for readers to compare with pictorial evidence Noted
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you a lot

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>